1	The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written
2	for publication and is <i>not</i> binding precedent of the Board
3	
4	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
5	
6	DEFORE THE DOADS OF DATENT ADDEALS
7	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
8	AND INTERFERENCES
9 10	
11	Ex parte DAVID K. McKNIGHT and EDUARDUS A.T. MERKS
12	Lx parte DAVIDIC. WORLYOTT and DDOTHOGOTA. I. WEIGHS
13	
14	Appeal 2006-2818
15	Application 09/489,793
16	Technology Center 2100
17	
18	
19	Decided: February 27, 2007
20	
21	
22	Before: ANITA PELLMAN GROSS, ROBERT E. NAPPI, and
23 24	ANTON W. FETTING, Administrative Patent Judges.
25	NAPPI, Administrative Patent Judge.
26	
27	
28	ORDER REMANDING TO THE EXAMINER
29	
30	This is a remand to the Examiner pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.50(a)(1)
31	(effective September 13, 2004, 69 Fed. Reg. 49960 (August 12, 2004)).
32	
33	

1	STATEMENT OF CASE
2	This case comes before us for a decision on appeal under
3	35 U.S.C. § 134 of the rejection of claims 1 through 13, 16 through 22, 24
4	through 36, and 40 through 43. The Examiner has indicated that claim 23
5	contains allowable subject matter.
6	From our review of the record, we find that the application is not in
7	condition for decision on appeal for the reasons which follow. Accordingly,
8	we remand the application to the Examiner to take appropriate action.
9	The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 13 and 40 through 43
10	under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
11	The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 13, 16 through 22, 24
12	through 36, and 40 through 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).
13	Claims 8 through 11, 21 and 31 through 34 are multiple dependent claims
14	which depend upon other multiple dependent claims. Therefore, these claims
15	are improper (See 37 C.F.R § 1.75 (c) and MPEP 608.01(n)), as the scope of
16	the claims is indeterminate. However, the Examiner has considered the
17	claims as being proper and has applied art to them in his rejections. We
18	remand this case for the Examiner to require that the Appellants place the
19	claims in proper form (we note that Office policy is for the Examiner to
20	object to the improper claims and require that they be canceled as set forth in
21	MPEP 608.01(n)).
22	The Examiner's rejection of claims 1 through 13 and 40 through 43
23	under 35 U.S.C. § 101 states "each of said claims can be fairly interpreted as
24	a series of mental and/or manual steps (i.e. mentally/manually manipulating,

2

1	formatting, parsing printed documents, etc.), and is therefore directed to
2	non-statutory subject matter." (Answer, page 3), While the claims may in
3	fact be directed to non-statutory subject matter, the Examiner's rejection
4	does not follow the analysis set forth in the Interim Guidelines for
5	Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility,
6	1300 Off. Gaz. Patent and Trademark Off. (O.G.) 142, 152 (Nov. 22, 2005).
7	This document is located at the following URL:
8 9 10	http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf
1	We encourage the Examiner to apply the analysis set forth in the Interim
12	Guidelines to support the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
3	
4	Thus, we REMAND the application to the Examiner to clarify the
5	issues noted supra. The Examiner may comply with this remand either by a
6	supplemental examiner's answer responsive to the above-noted issues or, if
7	appropriate, by re-opening prosecution to address the above noted issues. It
8	follows that Appellants should have an opportunity to respond to any such
9	supplemental answer by way of a further reply brief or via other action as
20	provided in 37 CFR § 41.50(a)(2).
21	This remand to the Examiner pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.50(a)(1)
22	(effective September 13, 2004, 69 Fed. Reg. 49960 (August 12, 2004), 1286
23	Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 21 (September 7, 2004)) is made for further
24	consideration of a rejection. Accordingly, 37 CFR § 41.50(a)(2) applies if a
25	supplemental Examiner's answer is written in response to this remand by the
26	Board.

Appeal 2006-2818 Application 09/489,793

1	This application, by virtue of its "special" status, requires immediate
2	action, see MPEP § 708.01 (item D), Eighth Edition, Rev. 3, August 2005.
3 4	REMAND
5	
6	
7	vsh
8	
9	
10	
11	IBM CORPORATION
12	3039 CORNWALLIS RD.
13	DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195
14	REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK NC 27709
15	